



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,423	03/30/2004	Bernie Crump	411951-238	5743
23879	7590	07/10/2008	EXAMINER	
O'Melveny & Myers LLP			HARPER, KEVIN C	
IP&T Calendar Department LA-1118				
400 South Hope Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/814,423	CRUMP ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kevin C. Harper	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed March 31, 2008 with respect to claims 1-2 and 4-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's remaining arguments filed March 31, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. Applicant argued that Berardi in view of Coppola does not make obvious the claimed invention. However, Berardi provides communication between a RFID base station and a terminal (para. 67, last six lines). In the same field of endeavor Coppola suggests providing emulation for a legacy device by an intermediary (fig. 2) for the purpose of using an older incompatible device with a newer system (col. 2, lines 33-36). In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, using a legacy device allows only a partial upgrade of a system (Coppola, col. 2, lines 33-36).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-2 and 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berardi et al. (US 2007/0265964) in view of Coppola et al. (US 6,630,138).

Claims 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berardi et al. (US 2007/0265964) in view of Coppola et al. (US 6,630,138) and Reynolds et al. (US 2001/0042786).

2. Regarding claims 1-6, 10 and 13-20, Berardi discloses a method of transmitting data between a RFID base station (fig. 1, item 104) and a terminal (item 110), where commands are generated (para. 67).

3. However, Berardi does not disclose emulating and converting the commands. Coppola discloses emulating a terminal and converting commands (fig. 2, items 42 or 44, and 46; note: LPOS - legacy controller). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to emulate a terminal and convert commands in the invention of Berardi in order to continue to use an older control device (Coppola, col. 2, lines 33-36).

4. Further regarding claim 1-2 and 3-9, Berardi in view of Coppola does not disclose at least one control character to distinguish the RFID data. Reynolds discloses a delimiter for RFID data (para. 69). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a control character to distinguish data in the invention of Berardi in view of Coppola in order to identify the RFID data (Reynolds, para. 69, lines 10-13).

5. Regarding claims 7 and 11-12, in Berardi the information is used to communicate with a barcode scanner (fig. 1, item 110; note: POS device - para. 35, lines 1-11).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-3166. The examiner can normally be reached weekdays from 11:00 AM to 7:00 PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Trost, can be reached at 571-272-7872. The centralized fax number for the Patent Office is 571-273-8300. For non-official communications, the examiner's personal fax number is 571-273-3166 and the examiner's e-mail address is kevin.harper@uspto.gov.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications associated with a customer number is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see portal.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kevin C. Harper/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2616

July 6, 2008